C

Agenda Item IV—Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Funding in Milwaukee County

Alternative 1 or 2

The original request to begin an RFP process for distribution of these funds was submitted as a passive review. Rep. Coggs objected, and it was placed on the agenda.

Surprisingly, Milwaukee County does not have a position on this paper. This contract has been awarded to Community Advocates, Inc. and the CAP Network of Milwaukee County for at least the last 10 years. Alternative 1 would open it up to a bidding process for the first time.

Alternative 2 would give CAP and Community Advocates the right of first refusal to the money. They would still be required to follow the guidelines set by DHFS for use and evaluation, but they would be allowed to have it based solely on their long standing receipt of the funds. Rep. Coggs supports Alt. 2.

LFB says that there have been no real problems with the way CAP and Community Advocates have handled the money in the past. However, they have not been required to demonstrate too much in the way of outcome or effect the funds have had on specific families or children. DHFS will require more of that type of evaluation this time around, so it remains to be seen how much success they are really having in the County.

Kara contacted us a while ago about this. Apparently, Children's Hospital would like to enter the RFP process, so I suspect they would prefer Alternative 1. I told her during the passive review that you likely would not object. Children's obviously would have preferred that the RFP process begin without the Committee having to debate the merits of a bidding process.

If Alternative 1 is moved by the Co-chairs, you should support it. You don't want to look like you don't support funding for child abuse prevention. It will still allow CAP and Community Advocates enter the bidding process, which they are fully prepared to do, and it will force all interested groups to submit more competitive proposals. However, I don't really see a problem with Alternative 2. It doesn't seem like a horrible idea to give CAP and Community Advocates an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to do a good job using the new state standards as guidelines. If they screw it up, JFC can always require a bidding process next time around.

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

December 2, 1998

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Health and Family Services: Funding for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention in Milwaukee County – Agenda Item IV

1997 Wisconsin Act 27 (the 1997-99 biennial budget) provides $744,800 GPR in 1997-98 and $1,489,600 GPR in 1998-99 in the Finance Committee's appropriation to fund child abuse and neglect prevention activities in Milwaukee County, beginning January 1, 1998. Act 27 requires the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) to submit a plan to the Department of Administration (DOA) for the use of these funds and to request the transfer of funds from the Committee's appropriation to the DHFS appropriation for Milwaukee child welfare services. Upon approval, DOA is directed to forward a plan to the Committee for its review under a 14-day passive review process.

In December, 1997, the Committee approved the transfer of $744,800 GPR in 1997-98 and $744,800 GPR in 1998-99 to DHFS for distribution in calendar year 1998 for prevention activities in Milwaukee County. At the time, DHFS indicated that it would later request the remaining $744,800 GPR in 1998-99 once it developed a plan for 1999. On October 30, 1998, DOA submitted a request to transfer the remaining $744,800 in 1998-99 to DHFS to fund child abuse and neglect prevention programs in Milwaukee County for the first six months of 1999. On November 18, the Co-Chairs notified DOA Secretary Bugher that this matter would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

BACKGROUND

Act 27 Provisions. Under provisions of Act 27, DHFS became responsible for the administration of child welfare activities in Milwaukee County, beginning January 1, 1998. In order to maintain funding for child abuse and neglect prevention that had been allocated by Milwaukee County prior to January 1, 1998, Act 27 placed $744,800 GPR in 1997-98 and $1,489,600 GPR in 1998-99 in the Committee's program supplements appropriation.

During the 1997-99 budget deliberations, Committee members raised concerns about the need for such programs and duplication of services in light of other activities in Milwaukee County to prevent child abuse and neglect. At the time, the administration provided little information about these programs. For these reasons, the Committee placed funding for these prevention programs in its appropriation, which would be available for transfer to DHFS once additional information on these programs was provided.

Calendar Year 1998 Contract. Under the plan approved by the Committee in December, 1997, DHFS distributed the $1,489,600 to the same organizations in the same amounts that Milwaukee County had distributed in 1997. The contract was awarded on a sole-source basis, which means that there was no competition for the contract. For most of the funding ($1,252,000), DHFS contracted with Community Advocates, Inc. as a lead agency for the Child Abuse Prevention (CAP) Network. The contract specified the amount of funding Community Advocates was required to distribute for six programs that were members of the CAP Network. The contract with Community Advocates did not provide any requirements for accountability or evaluation.

The remaining funds transferred by the Committee under the DHFS plan, ($237,600) were provided to three organizations through safety service referrals, since DHFS determined that these organizations provided services that were more appropriate for cases where child abuse or neglect was already occurring or at significant risk of occurring. Safety services are provided to those families where the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare has substantiated child abuse or neglect, but an assessment has determined that the child or children in the family could remain safe if services were provided in the families' home.

Description of DHFS Request for 1999. The DHFS plan for 1999 includes the issuance of a request–for-proposal (RFP) to select a lead agency to coordinate, implement, evaluate and manage a comprehensive and collaborative prevention program for calendar year 1999. The lead agency will not be a direct service provider. Instead, it will subcontract with various community-based agencies to provide services as part of a countywide continuum of services available to all families to prevent child abuse and neglect. The recipient of the grant will be expected to coordinate its efforts with other community initiatives with the goal of not only preventing child abuse and neglect, but also strengthening families and increasing self-sufficiency among the families served.

DHFS issued the RFP on November 5, 1998. The total amount of the contract will be for $1,489,600 with no more than 5% available to the lead agency for administrative and evaluation costs. The plan before the Committee requests the transfer of $744,800 GPR in 1998-99 to DHFS to fund the first six months of the contract. The remaining six months of the contract would be funded in the next biennium as provided in the DHFS budget request for 1999-2001.

Program Goals. In the RFP, DHFS identified seven program goals that will be examined as part of the evaluation of the grant recipient:

- Reduction in the incidence of substantiated child abuse and neglect in Milwaukee County;

- Increased universal access to family support programs aimed at preventing child abuse and neglect;

- Provision of intensive and voluntary family support services to parents of newborns who are identified as in need of services to prevent child abuse and neglect;

- Increased access to group-based parent education and family strengthening services;

- Enhanced coordination of child abuse and neglect prevention services among existing community programs;

- Increased awareness of child abuse and neglect prevention strategies within the community and within families by improving protective behavior skills in children of all ages;

- Increased utilization of community resources designed to provide family support and build self-sufficiency skills; and

- Development of a county-wide evaluation program of child abuse and neglect prevention services to assess the effectiveness of county-wide service delivery.

Selection Process. Unlike the 1998 award process, the selection of the recipient of the grant will be a competitive process with an evaluation by a committee consisting of a representative from the DHFS Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare, a child abuse and neglect prevention service provider from outside Milwaukee County and experts from DHFS.

Each respondent to the RFP will be reviewed and given points on various aspects including the organization's: (a) experience; (b) staff and qualifications of the vendors with whom the lead agency will contract; (c) understanding of the needs of the community; (d) collaboration and coordination with other organizations in the community with similar objectives and how duplication of services will be avoided; (e) ability to use these funds to leverage other sources of support for prevention of child abuse and neglect; (f) workplan for the project; and (g) plan for evaluation of the project. Each respondent will be ranked based on the amount of points scored.

Evaluation. DHFS will require an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the program as well as the effectiveness of collaborative efforts, coordination of services, fiscal management, data collection and overall community impact. The goals identified earlier will be examined as part of the evaluation. DHFS performance evaluation managers within the Bureau of Milwaukee Child

Welfare will be available to the grant recipient to assist in the implementation of the evaluation plan and provide access to data, as allowed by law, to determine the status of families served.

ANALYSIS

Contract Award Process. The DHFS plan represents a significant improvement over the process used to award the contract in 1998, since the contracts will be awarded on a competitive basis. It is the administration's policy that all contracts for services should be awarded on a competitive basis whenever possible. A competitive RFP process is generally considered preferable since: (a) the decision is usually made based on objective, rather than subjective, criteria; (b) a panel of qualified individuals reviews each organization's response to the RFP, rather than a single individual; and (c) the decision-making process is documented and open to review.

In 1998, the contracts were awarded on a sole-source basis. DHFS was unable to develop an RFP and review proposals in time to award the contracts by January 1, 1998, since staff were focusing on ensuring that the state was ready to takeover administration of the child welfare system on January 1, 1998.

Evaluation Process. No evaluation requirements were included in the 1998 contracts for prevention services in Milwaukee County. The 1999 contract will ensure that the recipient of these funds demonstrate its effectiveness in managing the funds, working with other organizations and that the organizations that receive funding are successful at reducing child abuse and neglect in Milwaukee County.

If the Committee wishes to ensure that the funding distributed under this request is distributed based on a competitive review, the Committee could approve the plan developed by DHFS. This alternative would not preclude the organization that received this funding in 1998 from competing and possibly receiving the contract for 1999, but instead would require that it compete with other organizations that respond to the RFP for that funding.

However, since Community Advocates, as lead agency for the CAP Network, has been a long-time recipient of these funds, both from DHFS in 1998 and from Milwaukee County for years prior to 1998, the Committee could approve the transfer of funds from the Committee's appropriation but require DHFS to give Community Advocates and the CAP Network the right of first refusal for the contract for 1999. The contract could still hold Community Advocates and the CAP Network responsible for the requirements included in the RFP, but the right of first refusal would be given to Community Advocates and the CAP Network out of consideration of their long-standing receipt of these funds.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the request to transfer $744,800 GPR in 1998-99 from the Committee's program supplements appropriation to the DHFS appropriation for Milwaukee child welfare services, as submitted by DOA.

2. Approve the request to transfer $744,800 GPR in 1998-99 from the Committee's program supplement appropriation to the DHFS appropriation for Milwaukee child welfare services. In addition, require DHFS to give Community Advocates, Inc. and the CAP Network of Milwaukee County the right of first refusal for the 1999 contract for child abuse and neglect prevention services in Milwaukee County.

3. Deny the request.

Prepared by: Rachel Carabell

MO# Alt 1

2 WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS 1

Senator Rosenzweig

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Grant

Motion:

Move to request the Co-chairs of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee to direct the Legislative Audit Bureau to perform a program evaluation audit of the Milwaukee County child abuse and neglect prevention grant awarded by the DHFS Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare in calendar year 1999 and that the Legislative Audit Bureau report its findings to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee no later than January 31, 2001.

MO#______________

2	WEEDEN	Y	N	A
	FARROW	Y	N	A
	COWLES	Y	N	A
	PANZER	Y	N	A
	SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
	ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
	BURKE	Y	N	A
	DECKER	Y	N	A
1	GARD	Y	N	A
	OURADA	Y	N	A
	HARSDORF	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	PORTER	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	HUBER	Y	N	A
	COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS 1

Motion #5499

V. Department of Health of Family and Family Services -- Joe Leean, Secretary

The department requests the approval of the transfer of $186,800 GPR in FY99 from the department's appropriation under s. 20.435(5)(b) to the appropriation under s. 20.435(7)(be) for purposes of funding specialized services for mentally ill residents in the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

Governor's Recommendation

Modify the request. Transfer $207,300 GPR to ensure funding for ten months of services.

V

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
101 East Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin

TOMMY G. THOMPSON
GOVERNOR
MARK D. BUGHER
SECRETARY

Mailing Address:
Post Office Box 7864
Madison, WI 53707-7864

Date: November 30, 1998

To: Members, Joint Committee on Finance

From: Mark D. Bugher, Secretary
Department of Administration

Subject: Section 13.10 Request from the Department of Health and Family Services for Funding for the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

Request

The department requests the approval of the transfer of $186,800 GPR in FY99 from the department's appropriation under s. 20.435(5)(b) to the appropriation under s. 20.435(7)(be) for purposes of funding specialized services for mentally ill residents in the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

Background

The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) provides a supplemental payment to Medicaid certified nursing facilities for residents with mental illness who require specialized services. The payments are funded entirely with GPR and are budgeted in the Medical Assistance's GPR appropriation. The Trempealeau County Health Care Center, which had received supplemental funding, is no longer a Medicaid certified nursing home and cannot receive funding under the Medicaid appropriation.

Analysis

By federal definition the Trempealeau County Health Care Center is an institution for mental diseases (IMD) since greater than 50% of the residents have a diagnosis of mental illness. Federal law prohibits any Medical Assistance (MA) reimbursement to an IMD for any resident who is between the ages of 18 and 64. However, federal law requires that any resident who is determined to need services through a Preadmission Screening and President Review receive the services. DHFS has provided funding for the specialized services at a rate of $9.00 per day.

In May of 1998 federal nursing home regulators cited the facility for use of physical restraints and seclusion of residents. Trempealeau County voluntarily surrendered its federal Medicaid certification and relocated its MA funded residents (age 65 and older). As of September 1, 1998 the facility became a state-only licensed nursing home with 76 beds. The county maintained that, given the characteristics of its residents and the need to prevent residents from harming others, it could not comply with the federal rules involving restraints and seclusion. Since September staff from DHFS have been working with the county and the use of restraints and seclusion has decreased.

The department requests that the facility continue to receive the supplemental payment because the remaining residents continue to need the specialized services. Since the payments can no longer be funded from the MA appropriation, the department requests the transfer of $186,800 GPR from s. 20.435(5)(a) to s. 20.435(7)(be). Funding is for the period of September 1, 1998 through June 30, 1998. If DHFS does not continue the funding, Trempealeau County will have to bill other counties for the cost of the services for their residents.

After submitting its request, DHFS discovered that, due to a calculation error, the $186,800 GPR will only support nine, rather than ten, months of services. An additional $20,500 GPR will need to be transferred to meet the department's intent.

Recommendation

Modify the request. Transfer $207,300 GPR to ensure funding for ten months of services.

Prepared by: Gretchen A. Fossum
266-2288

V

State of Wisconsin
Department of Health and Family Services

Tommy G. Thompson, Governor
Joe Leean, Secretary

November 16, 1998

The Honorable Tim Weeden
Senate Co-Chair, Joint Committee on Finance
1 East Main St., Room 230
Madison, WI 53702

The Honorable John Gard
Assembly Co-Chair, Joint Committee on Finance
Room 315 North, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Dear Senator Weeden and Representative Gard:

The Department requests the transfer of $186,800 GPR in FY 99 from the Department's appropriation under s. 20.435(5)(b) to the appropriation under s. 20.435(7)(be) for purposes of funding specialized services for mentally ill residents of the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

<u>Background</u>
As required by federal law, the Department currently provides a supplemental payment to Medicaid certified nursing facilities for residents with a mental illness who require specialized services for their condition. The Department provides the payment, equal to $9.00 per resident per day, for any resident determined to need the services through a Preadmission Screening and Resident Review (PASARR). The specialized services consist of supplemental care provided by mental health professionals who, according to federal rules, are responsible for "continuous and aggressive implementation of an individualized plan of care" for the resident. The payments are funded entirely with GPR and are budgeted in the Medical Assistance program's GPR appropriation.

The Department provided the Trempealeau County Health Care Center with the supplemental payments until September 1, 1998. Before that date, the center was a 123 bed, Medicaid certified nursing home. Almost all of the residents had a primary diagnosis of mental illness. The facility also met the federal definition of an institution for mental diseases (IMD), because greater than 50% of its residents had a diagnosis of mental illness and were admitted primarily to treat their mental illness. Federal law prohibits any MA reimbursement to an IMD for any of its residents aged 21 to 64. As a result, the facility could receive the normal MA reimbursement only for the basic care of its residents aged 65 and older. However, as required by federal law, the Department provided the supplemental payment for all residents who met the PASARR test, regardless of the residents' source of pay.

After a routine inspection visit in May 1998, federal nursing home regulators cited Trempealeau for excessive use of physical restraints on and seclusion of the residents, who sometimes act aggressively. The facility contended that these methods were necessary in order to prevent the residents from harming themselves or others. However, the federal officials determined that such methods violated federal regulations and ordered the facility to change its practices.

Trempealeau concluded that, given the characteristics of its residents, it could not comply with federal rules regarding restraints and seclusion. It therefore decided to voluntarily surrender its federal Medicaid certification and relocate its MA funded residents (those over 65) to another facility or to the community. As of September 1, 1998, it became a state-only licensed nursing home with 76 licensed beds.

The Department wishes to continue to make the $9.00 per day supplemental payment to the facility for its remaining residents because they continue to need specialized services. However, funds in the Medical Assistance appropriation under s. 20.435(5)(a) can only be paid to Medicaid certified providers. For this reason, the Department requests that the Committee transfer $186,800 GPR in FY 99 from the MA GPR appropriation to s. 20.435(7)(be), based on the cost of specialized services for 76 residents from September 1, 1998 through the end of the fiscal year.

This request meets the criteria for Committee action under s. 13.101(3)(a). The funds are necessary to maintain quality of care for the residents of the Trempealeau facility. The funds for this purpose were originally budgeted in the MA appropriation. Lastly, the transfer will allow the Department to provide specialized services to the residents as the Legislature intended.

Thank you for considering this request. I will represent the Department at the Committee's December meeting.

Sincerely,

Richard Lorang

for Joe Leean
Secretary

STATE OF WISCONSIN
OFFICE OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE B

P.O. BOX 8952
STATE CAPITOL
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53708-8952
608·266·7015
TOLL-FREE HOTLINE: 800·362·9472
FAX: 608·266·7038

Sen Burke
516(m)

December 2, 1998

Senator Tim Weeden
Senate Co-Chair, Joint Committee on Finance
1 East Main Street, Room 230
Madison, WI 53707

Representative John Gard
Assembly Co-Chair, Joint Committee on Finance
State Capitol, Room 315 North
Madison, WI 53708

Dear Senator Weeden and Representative Gard:

It is my understanding that this afternoon the Joint Committee on Finance will have before it for consideration a request from the Department of Health and Family Services to transfer $186,800 GPR in FY 99 from the department's appropriation of s.20.435(5)(b) to appropriation of s.20.435(7)(e) for the purposes of specialized services for the mentally ill residents of the Trempealeau County Health Care Center of my Assembly District.

I am aware also that Trempealeau County Health Care Center is requesting from the Joint Committee on Finance the transfer of $207,300 from and to the same statutory appropriation sections as noted by the Department Of Health and Family Services in its request. It is the sentiment of the Center that this amount of funding is essential to provide the needed specialized services for its mentally ill residents for the 10 month period of September 1, 1998 to the end of the fiscal year.

Trempealeau County Health Care Center ever since its establishment in 1898 has been a leader in providing lives of dignity, hope, and attention to the specialized needs of the residents it has served and continues to serve. At the present time the Center is providing needed specialized services to not only local county residents but also mentally ill individuals from 56 other counties of our state.

It is my hope that serious consideration will be given by the Joint Committee on Finance to providing these GPR dollars to Trempealeau County Health Care Center, at a level either requested by the Center or not less than requested by the Department of Health and Family Services.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gronemus

BARBARA GRONEMUS
State Representative-91st Assembly District

BG/wrc
c: Members of the Joint Committee on Finance
Mr. Phil Borreson, Trempealeau County Health Care Center

Agenda Item V—MA Funds for Services at Trempealeau County Health Care Center

Alternative 1

Trempealeau County Health Care Center currently receives MA funding for specialized services for mentally ill patients at their facility. Alternative 1 gives them all the federal funding they are allowed for these services.

The facility has been recently evaluated by DHFS, and they say Trempealeau is providing appropriate care for their residents. There doesn't seem to be any real reason not to give them all the money.

Alternative 2 would give them a reduced level because statutory language directs this money to provide care to a very specific type of patient. Currently 63 patients at this facility meet those requirements, but the funding is being provided for 76 patients. Technically, the funding should be reduced by the amount used for 13 patients. However, LFB does not adequately explain what would happen to those patients if the funding was abruptly stopped.

Since the facility receives patients from all around the state, presumably the funding would have to be provided by the county from which the patient was sent. Otherwise, the patient might have to be sent to another facility entirely. Sen,. Moen's office has contacted us and obviously supports Alt. 1. I told Missy you likely wouldn't have a problem with that. It seems to me that it's better to leave well enough alone unless someone really raises a stink.

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

December 2, 1998

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Health and Family Services: Section 13.10 Request for Transfer of MA Funds to Maintain Specialized Services for Residents of the Trempealeau County Health Care Center – Agenda Item V

The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) requests that the Committee transfer $186,800 GPR from the medical assistance (MA) benefits appropriation to the Department's appropriation for mental health treatment services in order to maintain current state funding of specialized mental health services for residents of the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

BACKGROUND

The Trempealeau County Health Care Center is a nursing home that specializes in the treatment of mental illness and, as a result, is considered an institute for mental disease (IMD). There are three IMDs in Wisconsin. If an IMD meets the various standards and regulations under MA and is MA-certified, the IMD is eligible for: (a) MA coverage for institutional services for children (21 years old and younger) and the elderly (65 years and older); and (b) state-only funding of $9 per day per resident for any resident that needs specialized mental health treatment services. Although MA does not provide coverage for institutional services for adults 22 to 64 years old, the state provides $11,861,000 GPR annually to assist counties in the support of persons residing in IMDs and persons relocated from an IMD to a community-based treatment program. This funding amount reflects the level of support that was provided in the year that MA ended IMD coverage for adults aged 22 to 64 years old. In general, the state pays counties 90% of the rate that was paid in 1989 under MA for care in an IMD. Because of inflation, this special state payment does not fully cover the costs of care.

Prior to September 1, 1998, the Trempealeau County Health Care Center was an MA-certified IMD and received MA coverage for young and elderly residents and benefited from the state supplemental payments of $9 per day per patient for each resident that needed specialized mental health treatment services. However, the Center has decided to voluntarily terminate its MA certification because its management believes that the facility cannot operate within federal regulations regarding the use of restraints and seclusion for a portion of its clientele. Many of the Center's residents have challenging behaviors and management believes that the facility must continue its current restraint and seclusion practices to prevent the residents from harming themselves or others. In conjunction with terminating its MA certification, the Trempealeau Center has: (a) established a state-only licensed nursing home with 76 licensed beds that will serve residents that have more challenging behaviors and who are, in general, middle-aged adults; (b) retained a distinct part MA-certified IMD that serves residents that can be treated within the guidelines of federal regulations and who are, in general, 65 years of age or older; and (c) relocated elderly residents who do not need the services of an IMD to either the community or the county's other nursing home, which does not specialize in the treatment of persons with mental illness.

As a result of these actions, the Trempealeau Center can utilize the techniques that it feels are necessary for dealing with its more challenging residents, while retaining MA coverage for its elderly residents who can be treated within the constraints of federal nursing home regulations. However, because state statutes limit the state supplemental payment for specialized services to MA-certified nursing homes, the Trempealeau Center has lost the supplemental payment for the residents of its state-only licensed IMD.

ANALYSIS

The Department requested a transfer of $186,800 to fund these supplemental payments for the period from September 1, 1998, to June 30, 1999. However, the amount of funding required to fund supplemental payments for a ten-month period is $207,300. The original request would only fund nine months of payments.

The Department believes that the supplemental payments are important to maintain the quality of care for the residents of the Trempealeau Center and recommends that the funding be continued by transferring the funding from the MA appropriation to the Department's appropriation for mental health treatment services.

One important consideration is assessing the Department's recommendation is whether the care provided by the Trempealeau Center merits support. If their procedures cannot meet federal nursing home regulations, there is a suggestion that the care provided is deficient in some regard. However, it appears that Trempealeau's problem with meeting federal regulations is not so much a problem of inappropriate care but rather a problem that federal nursing home regulations are not designed to accommodate the care of certain classes of the mentally ill. The procedures used by the Trempealeau Center are permissible in a federally regulated psychiatric hospital, but not in a federally regulated nursing home. Under federal nursing home regulations, restraints can only be used for the treatment of a medical condition or in an emergency. Federal rules do not permit restraints to be used in place of treatment to protect the resident from self-injurious behavior or physical harm to other residents or staff on a regular basis. DHFS has indicated that the Center's procedures provide appropriate care and that it would be very difficult to manage the type of residents who are cared for by the Trempealeau Center if the Center followed federal nursing home restrictions on restraints.

A related issue is whether an IMD that is subject to the staffing requirements of a nursing home, rather than a psychiatric hospital, should be allowed to use the techniques permissible in a psychiatric hospital. Nursing home regulations do not impose as high of a staffing requirement for professional staff as is required for psychiatric hospitals. It could be argued that persons with challenging behaviors who require the use of restraints may require the staffing level required in a psychiatric hospital. However, an IMD nursing home may provide an adequate and more cost-effective method for treating persons over a longer period of time. After a period of time in which an individual has been evaluated, various treatment techniques have been tried, and the treatment plan has been stabilized, it may appropriate and cost-effective to treat a person at the staffing level of an IMD nursing home when the treatment requires a more lengthy period of time. State administrative rules allow the use of restraints in a nursing home in order to deter the person from self-injurious behavior and to protect other residents.

A final issue is whether the Department's appropriation for mental health treatment services can be used to maintain state support of specialized mental health services at the Trempealeau Center. The statutes require that this appropriation be used to provide funding to counties for the care in an IMD or in the community for persons (or their replacement) who lost funding under MA because the nursing home in which they resided was found prior to July 1, 1989 by the federal health care financing administration to be an IMD. The Trempealeau Center was one of the state's nursing homes that was found to be an IMD prior to July 1, 1989, and currently has 63 beds that are funded under this appropriation at rates ranging from $29.29 to $56.11 per day. The statutory languages directs that the state share of noninstitutional medical services, as well as 90% of the daily institutional rate, be funded under this appropriation. Thus, payment of the $9 per day payment for specialized mental health services for at least 63 residents would appear to be permissible under this appropriation. However, the statutory language also limits the total number of persons supported under this appropriation to the number that lost MA-funding in 1989 due to a finding that the nursing home was an IMD. Thirteen of the 76 licensed beds at the Trempealeau IMD are not currently funded under this appropriation, and so, may not be eligible for funding under the current statutory language. Funding 63 persons, rather than 76, would require a transfer of $171,800 in 1998-99, rather than $207,300.

The Trempealeau Center serves individuals from a number of counties and could be considered a regional or statewide facility. Residents from 15 different counties are currently being served at the Trempealeau Center. Further, the Trempealeau facility provides a statewide service in that the facility tends to specialize in the care of individuals with challenging behaviors. This type of individual would tend to have a more difficult time finding a facility that would accept them for treatment. The financial benefit of continuing state support of the $9 per day payment will probably benefit other counties in addition to Trempealeau County, since counties that send their residents to the Trempealeau Center are liable for the costs of care at the facility. If the state no longer funded the $9 per day payment, the Trempealeau facility may raise the rate it charges to other counties for services provided to their residents.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Department's request, as modified to fund the payments for ten months, to transfer $207,300 GPR in 1998-99 from the MA benefits appropriation [s. 20.435(5)(b)] to the Department's appropriation for mental health treatment services [s. 20.435(7)(be)] to maintain the current funding of specialized mental health services for residents of the Trempealeau County Health Care Center.

2. Modify the Department's request by reducing the transfer to $171,800 GPR to recognize the limits allowed under current statutory provisions governing the appropriation for mental health treatment services.

3. Deny the Department's request.

MO# Alt 2

Prepared by: Richard Megna

1 WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
\ OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 0 ABS 1

VI. Department of Transportation -- Charles Thompson, Secretary and Sandra Beaupre, Budget Director

Pursuant to section 9148 of 1997 Wisconsin Act 86, the department requests approval of its plan to adjust state fiscal year 1998-99 appropriations to reflect the most recent estimates of federal funds appropriated to the department.

Rep. Burke - 516(M)

Memo

To: Joint Finance Members

From: Rep. Tim Hoven

Date: December 2, 1998

Re: Appropriation Increases to Allocate Additional Federal Highway Aid (Transportation Enhancements)

In July of this year, the Statewide Multi-Modal Program (SMIP) Committee, composed of nine members appointed by the Governor, met and recommended to WisDOT a list of projects to receive funding under the transportation Enhancements program. However, the demand for funds in this year's application cycle exceeded the amount available based on the current biennial state budget. Therefore, many projects were placed on a contingency list, awaiting your review of WisDOT's 1999 federal spending plan.

As you know, today you will be voting on WisDOT's request for 1998-99 appropriation increases to allocate $127,092,000 in additional federal highway aid, including $2,498,000 FED for transportation enhancements. I support WisDOT's request, and ask for your support so that Enhancement projects on the contingency list can be fully funded.

cn Burke
16(m)

Wisconsin State Assembly

P.O. BOX 8952 • MADISON, WI 53708

TO: Members of the Joint Finance Committee

FR: Representative Scott Walker and Representative Jeff Stone

DT: December 2, 1998

RE: Section 13.10 Transportation: Plan for Adjusting 1998-99 Appropriations for Additional Federal Aid – Agenda item VI

Today you will be asked to approve funding for 75% of the base cost for the 6th Street Viaduct Bridge in Milwaukee, over the next three years from the Local Bridge Improvement line. The total cost of the bridge is $39 million. The agreement for funding the new bridge calls for the state to pay 75% of the cost with the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County picking up the rest. Senator Burke is proposing that the state pay 1/3 of the 75% each year for the next three years which equates to $9.75 million per year.

I support Senator Burke's proposal, because I believe that moving forward with the project to reconstruct the 6th Street viaduct is vital for the long-term transportation needs of Southeastern Wisconsin and for the safety of those traveling on the current structure. As you know, completion of the 6th Street viaduct project is key to keeping the reconstruction of the Marquette Interchange on time. Ultimately, this issue will play a major role with regional transportation and economic development, not just in Milwaukee County, but throughout the state.

This request is designed to get the project moving so that we are not looking at future delays in other transportation projects vital to the area or even more safety concerns about a current structure that is already barricaded down to just two lanes. Your positive consideration of this request is appreciated.

Senator Burke

TRANSPORTATION

Sixth Street Bridge in Milwaukee

Motion:

Move to transfer $9,750,000 SEG from the state highway rehabilitation program to the accelerated local bridge improvement assistance program for costs related to replacing the Sixth Street Bridge in Milwaukee.

Note:

The Sixth Street Bridge project is an approved bridge under the local high-cost bridge program. Act 27 provided funding for the construction of two other approved bridges, plus additional funding for the design of the Sixth Street Bridge.

Under the program, the state pays 75% of the cost of approved bridges, while the city and the county in which the bridge is located split the remaining cost. The Sixth Street Bridge could be replaced for about $39 million, although the design currently favored by Milwaukee would cost about $8 million more because it includes features that are not functionally essential. This motion would provide one-third of the state's share of the $39 million cost (the basic design bridge). If this funding remains part of the base through the 1999-2001 biennium, then the full portion of the state's share would be paid by the end of that biennium.

Under the plan, total state and federal funding for the state highway rehabilitation program would increase by $73,710,300, from $455,122,900 to $528,833,200. This motion would reduce the size of the increase by $9,750,000, for a net increase of $63,960,300 and a resulting total program size of $519,083,200.

[Change to Plan: $0]

MO#__________________

WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
2 ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 4 NO 11 ABS 1

Representative Albers

TRANSPORTATION

Scenic Highways Program

Motion:

Move to require DOT to include a proposal for the creation of a state scenic byways program in the Department's 1999-01 budget request for the highway program.

Note:

Under federal law, a state must have a scenic byways program in order to be eligible for federal grants under the federal scenic byways program, or have highways designated as federal scenic byways.

Under TEA-21, the new federal transportation act, the receipt by a state of federal discretionary grants is not offset by a corresponding reduction in its regular federal highway aid, which had previously been the case. Consequently, there is now a greater incentive to seek discretionary grants. This motion would require DOT to submit a proposal for creating a state scenic byways program as part of the Department's 1999-01 budget request. If the program is created, the state would be eligible for this category of federal discretionary grants.

MO#__________

WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
2 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
1 ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 11 NO 4 ABS ____

Motion #5450

LFB paper

MO# 1 A+B, 2 B,

2 WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
1 GARD	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 1 ABS 0

Wisconsin State Assembly

P.O. BOX 8952 • MADISON, WI 53708

TO: Members of the Joint Finance Committee

FR: Representative Scott Walker and Representative Jeff Stone

DT: December 2, 1998

RE: Section 13.10 Transportation: Plan for Adjusting 1998-99 Appropriations for Additional Federal Aid – Agenda item VI

Today you will be asked to approve funding for 75% of the base cost for the 6th Street Viaduct Bridge in Milwaukee, over the next three years from the Local Bridge Improvement line. The total cost of the bridge is $39 million. The agreement for funding the new bridge calls for the state to pay 75% of the cost with the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County picking up the rest. Senator Burke is proposing that the state pay 1/3 of the 75% each year for the next three years which equates to $9.75 million per year.

I support Senator Burke's proposal, because I believe that moving forward with the project to reconstruct the 6th Street viaduct is vital for the long-term transportation needs of Southeastern Wisconsin and for the safety of those traveling on the current structure. As you know, completion of the 6th Street viaduct project is key to keeping the reconstruction of the Marquette Interchange on time. Ultimately, this issue will play a major role with regional transportation and economic development, not just in Milwaukee County, but throughout the state.

This request is designed to get the project moving so that we are not looking at future delays in other transportation projects vital to the area or even more safety concerns about a current structure that is already barricaded down to just two lanes. Your positive consideration of this request is appreciated.

Post-it™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 1
To Laurie Kuiper	From
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

connecting Wisconsin to the world

Wisconsin Transportation Builders Association

Kurt Bechthold, President
Payne & Dolan, Inc.
Waukesha, WI

Tom Walker
Executive Director

ARTBA American Road & Transportation Builders Association

WisDOT Federal Plan for FY 99

WTBA strongly supports Joint Finance Committee approval of the Department of Transportation's proposed comprehensive Plan to allocate additional federal funds to the Chapter 20 Appropriation Schedule for FY 99.

The Plan achieves these important transportation goals:

- The Plan clearly meets Congressional intent: supplement state and local resources through a <u>permanent</u> increase in ongoing highway infrastructure investment levels.
    - ♦ Most of the new highway funding ($73.1 million, or 58%) is allocated to State Highway Rehabilitation. The Department's Draft State Highway Plan demonstrates large and growing unmet needs in this area, including both statewide and Metro-Milwaukee facilities.
    - ♦ $14.7 is allocated to Major Projects, to accelerate previously delayed approved projects, ready for construction in 1999.
    - ♦ $23.3 million is allocated to state and local road and bridge rehabilitation projects.
- The Plan maintains the Legislature's existing allocation of federal funds between state and local programs: 73% state and 27% local. Therefore, state and local transportation programs will expand by the same percentage.
- The Plan ensures adequate funding for transportation research and for state and metropolitan planning, as required by TEA-21. WTBA places a high priority on expanded research and improved planning.
- The Plan fully allocates new Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Enhancement funding. With approval from SEWRPC, the Plan allocates the state share of CMAQ funding to continuing Amtrak support and Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance.
- The Plan adds to the $500,000 already allocated to Commissioner of Railroads-ordered rail crossings in September, and will fully fund the backlog of identified crossing needs over three years.
- The Plan provides a substantial boost to transit operating assistance for mid-sized and smaller systems, enabling system expansion and minimizing the need for fare increases.

1 S. Pinckney St., Suite 818 Madison, WI 53703 ♦ Tel. 608.256.6891 ♦ Fax 608.256.1670 ♦ E-mail: wtba@midplains.net

Senator Cowles

TRANSPORTATION

Major Highway Development Revenue Bonding

Motion:

Move to reduce the 1998-99 major highway development revenue bond appropriation by $30,000,000 SEG-S and to approve a modified plan for the allocation of federal aid as shown in the following table:

Appropriation	Change to Base
Federal Highway Funds	
Rail Passenger Service	$341,300
Local Bridge Improvement	1,526,600
Local Transportation Facility Improvement	16,290,400
Transportation Enhancements	1,906,800
Railroad Crossing Improvement	916,000
Surface Transportation Grants	0
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Improvement	5,281,400
Major Highway Development	41,209,300
State Highway Rehabilitation	56,264,200
Highway Maintenance	0
Highway Administration and Planning	1,829,400
Departmental Management and Operations	1,526,600
lotor Vehicle Emission Inspection nd Maintenance	0
'OTAL	$127,092,000
: Federal Funds	
ublic Transit Aids	$7,600,000
lderly and Disabled Capital Grants	300,000
epartmental Management and Operations	3,447,300
'OTAL	$11,347,300
L FEDERAL FUNDS	$138,439,300
Match Funds	
ocal Bridge Improvement	$381,700
ongestion Mitigation/Air Quality Improvement	1,320,400
ransportation Enhancements	476,700
ransit and Demand Management Aids	110,000
lderly and Disabled Aids	75,000
L LOCAL MATCH FUNDS	$2,363,800

IO#

VEEDEN	Y	N	A
'ARROW	Y	N	A
:OWLES	Y	N	A
'ANZER	Y	N	A
;CHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
3URKE	Y	N	A
)ECKER	Y	N	A
3ARD	Y	N	A
)URADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
LBERS	Y	N	A
'ORTER	Y	N	A
(AUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
:OGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 2 NO 13 ABS ____

Motion #5452

Note:

This motion would reduce the 1998-99 major highway development revenue bond appropriation by $30,000,000, from $110,535,300 to $80,535,300. To replace the bonding funds in the program, the motion, adopted as a substitute allocation plan, would reduce the amounts provided by DOT's plan to every appropriation, except passenger rail service, by 23.7%, and instead allocate those funds to the major highway development program. (The passenger rail service appropriation, which funds the federal share of the state's contract with Amtrak to run the Hiawatha train route, would not be affected because the change in DOT's plan only reflects a change in the federal matching percentage from 80% to 90%.) The net effect on the major highway development program would be an increase of $11,209,300 above the base, instead of an increase of $14,685,000, since the 23.7% reduction in above base funds would also apply to this program. The following table shows the net effect on the programs funded with federal highway funds. Programs funded with nonhighway federal funds would receive the same increases as under DOT's plan, and thus are not shown. Local match appropriations would be changed to reflect the changes in the federal funds, but are not shown in the following table. The changes to the base and the plan reflect revenue bond funds as well as federal funds:

Appropriation	Program Total*	Change Under DOT Plan	-----Motion----- Change to Base	Change to Plan
Rail Passenger Service	$3,412,500	$341,300	$341,300	$0
Local Bridge Improvement	32,752,400	2,000,000	1,526,600	-473,400
Local Transportation Facility Improvement	50,038,000	21,341,700	16,290,400	-5,051,300
Transportation Enhancements	$3,750,000	$2,498,000	$1,906,800	-$591,200
Railroad Crossing Improvement	2,299,300	1,200,000	916,000	-284,000
Surface Transportation Grants	2,720,000	0	0	0
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Improvement	$5,579,500	$6,919,000	$5,281,400	-$1,637,600
Major Highway Development	192,683,500	14,685,000	11,209,300	-3,475,700
State Highway Rehabilitation	455,122,900	73,710,300	56,264,200	-17,446,100
Highway Maintenance	$146,931,200	$0	$0	$0
Highway Administration and Planning	21,514,200	2,396,700	1,829,400	-567,300
Departmental Management and Operations	51,126,200	2,000,000	1,526,600	-473,400
Motor Vehicle Emission Inspection and Maintenance	$9,934,300	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	$977,864,000	$127,092,000	$97,092,000	-$30,000,000

* Includes federal, state and revenue bond funds.

[Change to Plan: -$30,000,000 SEG-S and -$675,500 SEG-L]

[Change to Base: -$30,000,000 SEG-S, $127,092,000 FED (highway), $11,347,300 FED (non-highway) and $2,363,800 SEG-L]

1. Why is this an emergency? ie main
Have FB define the emergency. We got the notice at 11:20 (2 hours, 10 minutes before the mtg.) not posted as of 11:40 AM (publically)

2. If we move this $ into the Committee's appropriation, are we in jeapordy later of having to pay it back to DWD? ~~?~~ ie. has the state met its maintenance of effort requirement? If not, when will that be fully determined ~~(~~ after the budget passed (LFB says not until next September.) ie too late for its uses
What are the penalties if we haven't met the MOE requirement.)

3. When did LFB/DOA know about the surplus? (probably early ~~Nov.~~ Oct.) (We've had weeks to talk about this, yet the co-chairs decide to add it at the 11th hour.) It's not prudent to act so quickly - take a step back and bring this back to the Committee when we have better #'s.

4. Given the history of DWD, what's the liklihood that they won't be back for this money later on?

Private W-2 agencies to share in profits

Five in Milwaukee County will divide millions more than expected

By Margo Huston
of the Journal Sentinel staff

Milwaukee County's five private Wisconsin Works agencies soon could share in at least $9 million in profits and $5.4 million in community reinvestment money, millions more than expected, according to an analysis of the W-2 surplus over the first 11 months of the program.

The profits, state officials say, are proof that the pioneering reform of welfare is working, but advocates for the poor said the numbers are evidence that some former welfare recipients have fallen through the cracks of the new system.

In this first public analysis of potential W-2 agency profits, the profit payments were calculated based on a $115 million statewide surplus in W-2, the state's pioneering reform of welfare.

The agencies are in the pro-

Please see W-2 page 11

Front page 10-13-98 Milw. Journal

W-2/Five private agencies to share at least $9 million in profits

From page 1

cess of signing contracts with the state that will allow them to receive the money later this year. The money originally was to be distributed a year later.

"I am surprised at the amount of profit dollars," County Board Chairman Karen Ordinans said. "I hope the state is surprised too. I would have expected more dollars to be spent on services to people."

Ordinans said Milwaukee County's W-2 agencies should use their profits to increase drug and alcohol treatment, to provide more services to fathers and to improve the child-care subsidy program.

Welfare surpluses are being reported all over the country, with the federal government estimating that states will not use $3 billion in available welfare funds this year. All states, except Hawaii, are reporting drops in caseloads.

In Wisconsin, less than a third of the 36,895 cash assistance families originally projected to be on W-2 at this point are now in the program — 10,500 families were receiving cash assistance in August.

"This is part of why we say there's been wonderful success," said Jean Rogers, administrator of the state Division of Economic Support. "People have been able to respond to the requirements and the supportive services at an even faster rate than we envisioned when we were setting our projections."

But community advocates say the large surpluses and low number of cash assistance participants are proof that all of the people in need are not being helped by the program. Neither the state nor the advocates have hard numbers to show what has happened to the thousands of families no longer in the program.

The new study of profits, based on W-2 agency contracts, budgets and spending levels through the first 11 months of W-2, was compiled by the Journal Sentinel based on information provided by the state and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

Richard Abelson, executive director of AFSCME District Council 48, which represents 10,500 employees in Milwaukee, said the study shows that "this is money diverted to profits that would otherwise be available for the county to use for social services."

"The principal problem," Abelson said, "is that Milwaukee County citizens are not going to benefit from this surplus."

In most Wisconsin counties, the profits will be paid to the counties because they also serve as W-2 agencies. Some of the counties are using the money to pay for services otherwise funded by the tax levy, AFSCME found.

In Milwaukee County, the W-2 program is administered by three non-profit agencies and two profit-making firms, Maximus and YW Works. YW Works is a partnership of CNR Health, Inc., Kaiser Group, and the YWCA.

Community reinvestment money must be used for programs that help the community, such as education and training or alcohol and drug treatment. Plans for use of the money must be approved by the state.

The five agencies, their projected profits and community reinvestment money for the first 11 months are:

- United Migrant Opportunity Services: $1,589,000 profits; $1,579,000 community reinvestment. An agency spokesman said profits would be invested so that the money would be available in case the economy declines and more people need W-2 services. The reinvestment money would go to help participants who have barriers to self-sufficiency, such as addictions, lack of education and domestic abuse.
- Opportunities Industrialization Center of Greater Milwaukee (OIC): $1,678,000 profits; $1,270,000 community reinvestment. An agency spokesman said OIC's board of directors would determine the uses of both the profits and the reinvestment money.
- Employment Solutions, a division of Goodwill Industries: $2,943,000 profits; $1,074,000 community reinvestment. A spokesman said that some of the profits would go into Goodwill programs.
- Maximus: $1,506,000 profits; $417,146 community reinvestment. The agency declined to comment.
- YW Works: $1,218,000 profits; $1,086,000 community reinvestment. The agency declined to comment.

The W-2 surplus for the agencies in Milwaukee County is $26 million, state records show. Money available to agencies includes profits — at least $9 million — and community reinvestment funds — $5.4 million. A share of the unspent money will also revert to the state.

The agencies are expected to receive the money in December or January.

Rogers said that add-on provisions to W-2 contracts were in the final stage of approval that would allow agencies — and counties — to receive profits and reinvestment money in December or January that otherwise would not have been available for another year.

The counties and agencies, Rogers said, wanted more of their potential profits and reinvestment money up front so they could begin reinvesting in their communities.

What the state and the agencies are finalizing is a system to distribute in December or January some of the money that would have been available to the agencies a year later.

"We're creating a process by which agencies that decide that they want to, after the first 12 months of the contract, may draw down those additional funds," said Linda Stewart, secretary of the Department of Workforce Development, which oversees the W-2 program.

The contracts began on Sept. 1, 1997, so the first year goes through Aug. 31, 1998. So far, the state has the figures only through July 30.

Stewart said that under the new provision, if the agencies "drew down those dollars and find out they needed more for core services, they would have to come up with other money to take care of those core services."

Rogers emphasized that if agencies "choose to access a percentage of their profits based on their own estimates of future needs — and they guess wrong, they'll have to repay it out of their pockets."

Stewart: "And they understand that."

STATE OF WISCONSIN

SENATE CHAIR
TIMOTHY WEEDEN

Room 203, 1 East Main Street
P.O. Box 7882
Madison, WI 53703
Phone: 266-2253

ASSEMBLY CHAIR
JOHN GARD

315 North, State Capitol
P.O. Box 8952
Madison, WI 53708-8952
Phone: 266-2343

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

December 2, 1998

Ms. Linda Stewart, Secretary
Department of Workforce Development
201 E. Washington Avenue, 400X
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Secretary Stewart:

It is our understanding that the current W-2 agency contracts will terminate on December 31, 1999, and that the Department of Workforce Development is in the process of establishing new contracts for the two-year period from January 1, 2000, through December 31, 2001. A number of legislators have expressed concern about the method of calculating and distributing surplus funding under the existing contracts, which allows agencies to retain a portion of excess funding as unrestricted profit without regard to the agency's performance in placing and retaining individuals in unsubsidized jobs. We believe this provision of the contract may provide an incentive for the agencies to focus more on reducing caseloads than on truly assisting families to become self-sufficient.

We are writing to encourage the Department to base any profit calculation under the new W-2 agency contracts on measures of agency performance. These should include criteria such as placements of W-2 applicants or participants in unsubsidized jobs, whether the jobs are full-time or part-time, job retention by former applicants or participants (and whether they return to the program), wages and benefits earned by former applicants or participants, appropriate implementation of all components of the program and customer satisfaction.

The new contracts should not permit agencies to receive profits based on caseload decreases or reduced agency spending that are not directly attributable to placement of W-2 applicants or participants in unsubsidized employment. We would also encourage the Department to develop a system to track former applicants and participants to ensure that agency performance is reliably measured.

It is our belief that structuring the new contracts in this way will provide more appropriate incentives for the local agencies to effectively serve W-2 participants and increase the long-run success of the program.

Sincerely,

TIM WEEDEN
Senator Chair

JOHN GARD
Assembly Chair

TW/JG/dh

cc: Members, Joint Committee on Finance

Senator Burke

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Transfer of GPR Public Assistance Funding

Motion:

Move to transfer $15,000,000 GPR from the Department of Workforce Development's appropriation for Wisconsin Works and other public assistance benefits and administration [20.445(3)(dz)] in 1998-99 as follows: (a) $5,100,000 to the Department of Health and Family Services' appropriation for community aids [20.435(7)(b)] to be distributed to counties in calendar year 1999; and (b) $9,900,000 to the Joint Committee on Finance's program supplements appropriation [20.865(4)(a)]. Authorize DWD to replace the transferred GPR funds with federal TANF revenues.

Note:

This motion would transfer $5.1 million GPR from DWD's appropriation for W-2 and other public assistance programs to DHFS's community aids appropriation and $9.9 million to the Committee's program supplements appropriation in 1998-99. DWD would be authorized to replace the transferred GPR with federal temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) revenues.

Transfer to Community Aids. Currently, under s. 46.40 (2), DHFS can distribute no more than $284,948,500 in 1998-99 for the basic county allocation under community aids. It is currently estimated that the actual amount distributed for the basic county allocation in 1998-99 will total $279,847,600 or approximately $5.1 million less than the amount included under s. 46.40 (2). Primarily, the difference between the current estimate and the statutory amount reflects a reduction in the federal social services block grant ($7.6 million in federal fiscal year 1998-99) included in the most recent federal budget session. These funding reductions were not anticipated when the Legislature was considering the 1997-99 biennial budget and were therefore not reflected in the funding provided for community aids or the statutory allocation. This federal reduction first affects community aids contracts for calendar year 1999.

Transfer to Joint Finance Appropriation. The Committee could use the $9.9 million to supplement other programs during 1998-99, or the funds could remain in the Committee's appropriation and lapse to the general fund at the end of the current fiscal year.

TANF Maintenance of Effort Requirement. Transferring $15,000,000 of GPR funding from DWD would reduce the amount of state expenditures that can be counted toward the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement under the federal TANF program, which is described below.

Under federal law, a state must spend an amount of state dollars equal to 75% of historic state expenditures if the state meets federal mandatory work requirements or 80% if the state does not meet these requirements. Historic state expenditures generally means federal fiscal year (FFY) 1994 expenditures for the former AFDC and JOBS programs, AFDC-emergency assistance, AFDC-related child care and at-risk child care. It is estimated that the state's MOE requirement for FFY 1998 is $168.8 million, based on 75% of historic state expenditures.

Based on the most recent information available, it is currently estimated that GPR funding appropriated to DWD for the W-2 program may exceed the amount needed to meet the MOE requirement by approximately $20 million in 1998-99. However, this estimate is based on several assumptions. It is possible that changes in required modifications to cost allocation assumptions, federal requirements regarding the earned income tax credit and homestead tax credit, and lower than anticipated allowable child support collections could reduce this figure significantly.

Federal law includes substantial penalties if a state fails to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. First, the state's basic TANF grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the MOE requirement. Further, if the TANF grant is reduced in a fiscal year under this provision, the state must expend additional state revenues in the following year equal to the amount of the reduction. In addition, if a state receives a welfare-to-work (WtW) formula grant and fails to meet the TANF maintenance of effort, the amount of the TANF block grant will be reduced in the following year by an amount equal to the WtW grant (approximately $12.9 million in Wisconsin).

Finally, it should be noted that, because this motion would place $9.9 million in the Committee's appropriation, these funds could be transferred back to DWD if subsequent information indicates that they will be needed for the MOE requirement.

Senator Burke

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Transfer of GPR Public Assistance Funding

Motion:

Move to modify motion # 5295 to instead transfer $15,000,000 GPR from the Department of Workforce Development's appropriation for Wisconsin Works and other public assistance benefits and administration [20.445(3)(dz)] in 1998-99 as follows: (a) $5,100,000 to the Department of Health and Family Services' appropriation for community aids [20.435(7)(b)] to be distributed to counties in calendar year 1999; and (b) $9,900,000 to the Joint Committee on Finance's program supplements appropriation [20.865(4)(a)]. Authorize DWD to replace the transferred GPR funds with federal TANF revenues.

Note:

This motion would modify motion #5295 to transfer $5.1 million GPR from DWD's appropriation for W-2 and other public assistance programs to DHFS's community aids appropriation and $9.9 million to the Committee's program supplements appropriation in 1998-99. DWD would be authorized to replace the transferred GPR with federal temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) revenues.

Transfer to Community Aids. Currently, under s. 46.40 (2), DHFS can distribute no more than $284,948,500 in 1998-99 for the basic county allocation under community aids. It is currently estimated that the actual amount distributed for the basic county allocation in 1998-99 will total $279,847,600 or approximately $5.1 million less than the amount included under s. 46.40 (2). Primarily, the difference between the current estimate and the statutory amount reflects a reduction in the federal social services block grant ($7.6 million in federal fiscal year 1998-99) included in the most recent federal budget session. These funding reductions were not anticipated when the Legislature was considering the 1997-99 biennial budget and were therefore not reflected in the funding provided for community aids or the statutory allocation. This federal reduction first affects community aids contracts for calendar year 1999.

Transfer to Joint Finance Appropriation. The Committee could use the $9.9 million to supplement other programs during 1998-99, or the funds could remain in the Committee's appropriation and lapse to the general fund at the end of the current fiscal year.

TANF Maintenance of Effort Requirement. Transferring $15,000,000 of GPR funding from DWD would reduce the amount of state expenditures that can be counted toward the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement under the federal TANF program, which is described below.

Under federal law, a state must spend an amount of state dollars equal to 75% of historic state expenditures if the state meets federal mandatory work requirements or 80% if the state does not meet these requirements. Historic state expenditures generally means federal fiscal year (FFY) 1994 expenditures for the former AFDC and JOBS programs, AFDC-emergency assistance, AFDC-related child care and at-risk child care. It is estimated that the state's MOE requirement for FFY 1998 is $168.8 million, based on 75% of historic state expenditures.

Based on the most recent information available, it is currently estimated that GPR funding appropriated to DWD for the W-2 program may exceed the amount needed to meet the MOE requirement by approximately $20 million in 1998-99. However, this estimate is based on several assumptions. It is possible that changes in required modifications to cost allocation assumptions, federal requirements regarding the earned income tax credit and homestead tax credit, and lower than anticipated allowable child support collections could reduce this figure significantly.

Federal law includes substantial penalties if a state fails to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. First, the state's basic TANF grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the MOE requirement. Further, if the TANF grant is reduced in a fiscal year under this provision, the state must expend additional state revenues in the following year equal to the amount of the reduction. In addition, if a state receives a welfare-to-work (WtW) formula grant and fails to meet the TANF maintenance of effort, the amount of the TANF block grant will be reduced in the following year by an amount equal to the WtW grant (approximately $12.9 million in Wisconsin).

Finally, it should be noted that, because this motion would place $9.9 million in the Committee's appropriation, these funds could be transferred back to DWD if subsequent information indicates that they will be needed for the MOE requirement.

MO# 5300

WEEDEN	Y	N	A
FARROW	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
SCHULTZ	Y	N	A
ROSENZWEIG	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 1 NO 10 ABS 5

Representative Gard

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Transfer of GPR Public Assistance Funding

Motion:

Move to transfer $15,000,000 GPR from the Department of Workforce Development's appropriation for Wisconsin Works and other public assistance benefits and administration [20.445(3)(dz)] to the Joint Committee on Finance's program supplements appropriation [20.865(4)(a)] in 1998-99. Authorize DWD to replace the transferred GPR funds with federal TANF revenues.

Note:

This motion would transfer $15,000,000 GPR from DWD's appropriation for W-2 and other public assistance benefits and administration to the Committee's program supplements appropriation. DWD would be authorized to replace the transferred GPR with federal temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) revenues. The Committee could use the transferred GPR funds to supplement other programs during 1998-99, or the funds could remain in the Committee's appropriation and lapse to the general fund at the end of the current fiscal year.

Transferring $15,000,000 of GPR funding from DWD would reduce the amount of state expenditures that can be counted toward the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement under the federal TANF program, which is described below.

Under federal law, a state must spend an amount of state dollars equal to 75% of historic state expenditures if the state meets federal mandatory work requirements or 80% if the state does not meet these requirements. Historic state expenditures generally means federal fiscal year (FFY) 1994 expenditures for the former AFDC and JOBS programs, AFDC-emergency assistance, AFDC-related child care and at-risk child care. It is estimated that the state's MOE requirement for FFY 1998 is $168.8 million, based on 75% of historic state expenditures.

Based on the most recent information available, it is currently estimated that GPR funding appropriated to DWD for the W-2 program may exceed the amount needed to meet the MOE requirement by approximately $20 million in 1998-99. However, this estimate is based on several assumptions. It is possible that changes in required modifications to cost allocation assumptions, federal requirements regarding the earned income tax credit and homestead tax credit, and lower than anticipated allowable child support collections could reduce this figure significantly.

Federal law includes substantial penalties if a state fails to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. First, the state's basic TANF grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the MOE requirement. Further, if the TANF grant is reduced in a fiscal year under this provision, the state must expend additional state revenues in the following year equal to the amount of the reduction. In addition, if a state receives a welfare-to-work (WtW) formula grant and fails to meet the TANF maintenance of effort, the amount of the TANF block grant will be reduced in the following year by an amount equal to the WtW grant (approximately $12.9 million in Wisconsin).

Finally, it should be noted that, because this motion would place the $15 million in the Committee's appropriation, these funds could be transferred back to DWD if subsequent information indicates that they will be needed for the MOE requirement.

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671	# of pages ▸ 4
To Rosa Dominguez	From
Co.	Co.
Dept.	Phone #
Fax #	Fax #

Senator Burke

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Transfer of GPR Public Assistance Funding

Motion:

Move to modify motion # 5295 to instead transfer $15,000,000 GPR from the Department of Workforce Development's appropriation for Wisconsin Works and other public assistance benefits and administration [20.445(3)(dz)] in 1998-99 as follows: (a) $5,100,000 to the Department of Health and Family Services' appropriation for community aids [20.435(7)(b)] to be distributed to counties in calendar year 1999; and (b) $9,900,000 to the Joint Committee on Finance's program supplements appropriation [20.865(4)(a)]. Authorize DWD to replace the transferred GPR funds with federal TANF revenues.

Note:

This motion would modify motion #5295 to transfer $5.1 million GPR from DWD's appropriation for W-2 and other public assistance programs to DHFS's community aids appropriation and $9.9 million to the Committee's program supplements appropriation in 1998-99. DWD would be authorized to replace the transferred GPR with federal temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) revenues.

Transfer to Community Aids. Currently, under s. 46.40 (2), DHFS can distribute no more than $284,948,500 in 1998-99 for the basic county allocation under community aids. It is currently estimated that the actual amount distributed for the basic county allocation in 1998-99 will total $279,847,600 or approximately $5.1 million less than the amount included under s. 46.40 (2). Primarily, the difference between the current estimate and the statutory amount reflects a reduction in the federal social services block grant ($7.6 million in federal fiscal year 1998-99) included in the most recent federal budget session. These funding reductions were not anticipated when the Legislature was considering the 1997-99 biennial budget and were therefore not reflected in the funding provided for community aids or the statutory allocation. This federal reduction first affects community aids contracts for calendar year 1999.

Transfer to Joint Finance Appropriation. The Committee could use the $9.9 million to supplement other programs during 1998-99, or the funds could remain in the Committee's appropriation and lapse to the general fund at the end of the current fiscal year.

TANF Maintenance of Effort Requirement. Transferring $15,000,000 of GPR funding from DWD would reduce the amount of state expenditures that can be counted toward the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement under the federal TANF program, which is described below.

Under federal law, a state must spend an amount of state dollars equal to 75% of historic state expenditures if the state meets federal mandatory work requirements or 80% if the state does not meet these requirements. Historic state expenditures generally means federal fiscal year (FFY) 1994 expenditures for the former AFDC and JOBS programs, AFDC-emergency assistance, AFDC-related child care and at-risk child care. It is estimated that the state's MOE requirement for FFY 1998 is $168.8 million, based on 75% of historic state expenditures.

Based on the most recent information available, it is currently estimated that GPR funding appropriated to DWD for the W-2 program may exceed the amount needed to meet the MOE requirement by approximately $20 million in 1998-99. However, this estimate is based on several assumptions. It is possible that changes in required modifications to cost allocation assumptions, federal requirements regarding the earned income tax credit and homestead tax credit, and lower than anticipated allowable child support collections could reduce this figure significantly.

Federal law includes substantial penalties if a state fails to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. First, the state's basic TANF grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the MOE requirement. Further, if the TANF grant is reduced in a fiscal year under this provision, the state must expend additional state revenues in the following year equal to the amount of the reduction. In addition, if a state receives a welfare-to-work (WtW) formula grant and fails to meet the TANF maintenance of effort, the amount of the TANF block grant will be reduced in the following year by an amount equal to the WtW grant (approximately $12.9 million in Wisconsin).

Finally, it should be noted that, because this motion would place $9.9 million in the Committee's appropriation, these funds could be transferred back to DWD if subsequent information indicates that they will be needed for the MOE requirement.

Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

November 30, 1998

TO: Representative John Gard
Room 315 North, State Capitol

FROM: Rob Reinhardt, Program Supervisor

SUBJECT: Unexpended Funding Under the Agency Contracts for the Wisconsin Works (W-2) Program

At your request, I am providing information regarding surplus revenues that will be retained by the state due to unexpended funding under the W-2 agency contracts. In addition, information is provided on the federal maintenance of effort requirements under the temporary assistance to needy families (TANF) program.

Distribution of Surplus Funding Under the W-2 Agency Contracts

The W-2 agency implementation contract includes funding for subsidized employment benefits, W-2 office costs and other program expenses. The contract period is September 1, 1997, through December 31, 1999. Each agency contract provides that any funding in excess of that used for benefits and other allowable expenses is to be distributed according to a formula developed by the Department of Workforce Development (DWD).

The formula establishes a two-tier distribution mechanism for excess agency funds. Under the first tier, the agency is allowed to retain an amount equal to 7% of the implementation contract amount as unrestricted profit. Under the second tier, any remaining surplus funds are divided between the agency and the state as follows: (a) 10% is retained by the agency for unrestricted use; (b) 45% is retained by the agency for reinvestment in the community; and (c) 45% is retained by the state. If unexpended funds are less than 7% of the contract amount, the entire surplus is retained by the agency and the second-tier calculation does not apply.

The following simplified example clarifies how this formula works. If an agency's implementation contract was $5.0 million, and the agency had $600,000 remaining at the end of the contract period, the excess funding would be divided between the agency and the state. First, $350,000 would be provided to the agency as profit (7% of the implementation contract). The remaining $250,000 would then be divided in the following way: (a) 10%, or $25,000, would be provided to the agency for unrestricted use; (b) 45%, or $112,500, would be returned to the state; and (c) 45%, or $112,500, would be provided to the agency and the agency would then be required to reinvest those funds in the community under a plan approved by DWD. However, if the agency had less than $350,000 remaining at the end of the contract period, the entire surplus amount would be retained by the agency as profit.

The W-2 implementation contract allows for a calculation of unexpended funding to be made twice during the contract period: a preliminary profit calculation, which will be distributed in the 1998-99 state fiscal year, and a final profit calculation that will occur in the 1999-01 biennium. The preliminary profit calculation is described below.

Preliminary Profit Calculation

The contract provides for a preliminary profit distribution based on expenditures through August 31, 1998. Under this provision, up to 75% of the unexpended funding for the first year of the contract may be distributed according to the formula outlined above.

In order to receive a preliminary distribution, agencies were required to submit written requests to DWD by November 16, 1998. In order to obtain the 45% share for community reinvestment, agencies were also required to submit a proposed plan describing the services to be provided, the recipients of the services, the time period during which services will be provided, the service providers and how the community reinvestment services do not duplicate services or persons to be served under the W-2 implementation contract. According to DWD, services provided must be allowable under federal requirements for the use of TANF funds, and administrative costs will be limited to 10% of total expenditures. These plans were also due on November 16, 1998.

The 7% portion of the preliminary profits will be distributed by December 31, 1998, and the remaining portion of the preliminary profits will be distributed upon approval by DWD of the plan pertaining to community reinvestment.

It is important to note that the contract gives agencies the option of receiving the full 75% of the estimated amount of profit, or an amount less than 75%. Further, the state will not retain its 45% share of the second-tier profit unless the agency also requests its 45% share for community reinvestment. Therefore, if an agency chooses to receive only 25% of the funds available for community reinvestment, the state share would also be 25%.

Based on expenditures through August 31, 1998, the total contract surplus amount for all agencies was $131.3 million. Of this surplus, the maximum amount that could have been distributed under the preliminary profit calculation was $98.5 million (75% of $131.3 million). Of the $98.5 million amount: (a) up to $25 million could have been retained by the agencies for unrestricted use (the 7% first-tier amount plus 10% of the remainder); (b) up to $36.7 million could have been distributed for community reinvestment; and (c) up to $36.7 million could have been retained by the state.

According to DWD, the actual requests that were submitted by the agencies did not request the maximum amounts outlined above. Instead, statewide, the agencies requested an estimated $18.9 million for unrestricted use and $13.7 million for community reinvestment. Therefore, the amount retained by the state in 1998-99 will also be $13.7 million.

TANF Maintenance of Effort Requirement

You also asked for information regarding the federal maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements under the TANF program.

Under federal law, a state must spend an amount of state dollars equal to 75% of historic state expenditures if the state meets federal mandatory work requirements, or 80% if the state does not meet these requirements. Historic state expenditures generally means federal fiscal year (FFY) 1994 expenditures for the former AFDC and JOBS programs, AFDC-emergency assistance, AFDC-related child care and at-risk child care. In addition, the MOE may be reduced by the percentage reduction in the state's TANF block grant attributable to tribal programs. It is estimated that the state's MOE requirement for FFY 1998 is $168.8 million, based on 75% of historic state expenditures.

If the current state funding appropriated for the W-2 program is in excess of that needed to meet the MOE requirement, GPR funding currently budgeted for the W-2 program could be replaced with excess TANF funds. The GPR would then be available for other uses, without restriction.

Based on the most recent information available, it is currently estimated that GPR funding appropriated to DWD for the W-2 program may exceed the amount needed to meet the MOE requirement by some $20 million in 1998-99. However, this estimate is based on several assumptions. It is possible that changes in required modifications to cost allocation assumptions, federal requirements regarding the earned income tax credit and homestead tax credit, and lower than anticipated allowable child support collections could reduce this figure significantly.

Federal law includes substantial penalties if a state fails to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. First, the state's basic TANF grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the MOE requirement. Further, if the TANF grant is reduced in a fiscal year under this provision, the state must expend additional state revenues in the following year equal to the amount of the reduction. Finally, if a state receives a welfare-to-work (WtW) formula grant and fails to meet the TANF maintenance of effort, the amount of the TANF block grant will be reduced in the following year by an amount equal to the WtW grant (approximately $12.9 million in Wisconsin).

I hope this information is helpful. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

R-1

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
101 East Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin

TOMMY G. THOMPSON
GOVERNOR
MARK D. BUGHER
SECRETARY

Mailing Address:
Post Office Box 7864
Madison, WI 53707-7864

November 30, 1998

The Honorable Tim Weeden
State Senate
203 East, Capitol
Madison, WI 53707-8952

The Honorable John Gard
State Assembly
315 North, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53707-8952

Dear Senator Weeden and Representative Gard:

Attached is our report as required under s. 16.50, Wisconsin Statutes, on the number of federally funded positions approved during the July 1 - September 30, 1998 quarter. Also shown are changes in positions approved by the UW-System and by the Legislature during the same period. There were 16.25 federal positions approved in the quarter and 7.0 deleted for a net increase of 9.25 FTE.

Of the new positions created, the Department of Public Instruction received 1.0 FTE for School Meals for Healthy Children, 1.0 FTE for Technology Literacy Challenge program, 1.0 FTE for Goals 2000 - Reading, English, Language Arts, 2.0 FTE for Milwaukee Parental Choice Program. The Wisconsin Technical College Services Board received 1.0 FTE from the Carl Perkins grant. The Department of Natural Resources received .75 FTE for Trout Habitat Restoration. The Department of Justice received 4.0 FTE for High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas grant from the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The Department of Veterans Affairs received 1.50 FTE for Job Training Partnership Act for homeless veterans. Lastly, the Department of Administration received 1.0 FTE for the State Energy program.

Also attached is our report on the surplus positions created for the same quarter.

We would be happy to answer any questions you may have on these reports.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Bugher
Secretary
Attachments (2)

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Administration	1,112.16							1,114.16
GPR	171.71							171.71
PRO/PRS	862.84	2.00						864.84
Federal	64.41	1.00	-1.00					64.41
SEG	13.20							13.20
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board	1.50							1.50
GPR	1.50							1.50
Aging and Long-Term Care	22.90							23.90
GPR	15.45							15.45
PRO/PRS	7.45	1.00						8.45
Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection	709.58							712.58
GPR	317.86							317.86
PRO/PRS	259.67							259.67
Federal	64.35	3.00						67.35
SEG	67.70							67.70
Arts Board	12.00							12.00
GPR	5.00							5.00
PRO/PRS	1.00							1.00
Federal	6.00							6.00
Child Abuse & Neglect Prevention Board	4.00							4.00
PRO/PRS	4.00							4.00
Circuit Court	496.00							496.00
GPR	496.00							496.00

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Commerce	452.15							452.15
GPR	85.85							85.85
PRO/PRS	243.75							243.75
Federal	27.35							27.35
SEG	95.20							95.20
Corrections	8,577.09							8,577.09
GPR	7,086.32							7,086.32
PRO/PRS	1,490.77							1,490.77
Court of Appeals	75.50							75.50
GPR	75.50							75.50
District Attorneys	380.00							387.80
GPR	364.00							364.00
PR	16.00	7.80						23.80
Educational Communications Board	87.50							87.50
GPR	61.75							61.75
PRO	25.75							25.75
Elections Board	13.00							13.00
GPR	13.00							13.00
Employe Trust Funds	172.85							174.85
SEG	172.85					2.00		174.85
Employment Relations Commission	33.50							33.50
GPR	28.50							28.50
PR	5.00							5.00

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Deletes	UW Approved Adds	Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Employment Relations Department	86.50							87.50
GPR	80.05							80.05
PRO/PRS	6.45	1.00						7.45
FED	0.00							0.00
Ethics Board	6.00							6.00
GPR	3.00							3.00
PRO/PRS	3.00							3.00
Financial Institutions	168.50							168.50
PR	168.50							168.50
Governor's Office	46.05							46.05
GPR	46.05							46.05
Health and Family Services	6,368.15							6,369.15
GPR	1,865.23					5.00		1,870.23
PRO/PRS	3,544.72							3,544.72
Federal	953.20		-4.00					949.20
SEG	5.00							5.00
Higher Educational Aids Board	22.00							22.00
GPR	11.50							11.50
PR	5.50							5.50
SEG	1.50							1.50
FED	3.50							3.50

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Historical Society	178.90							178.90
GPR	146.50							146.50
PRO/PRS	23.30							23.30
Federal	5.85							5.85
SEG	3.25							3.25
Insurance	124.00							124.00
PRO	111.25							111.25
SEG	12.75							12.75
Investment Board	101.50							101.50
PRO	101.50							101.50
Judicial Commission	2.00							2.00
GPR	2.00							2.00
Justice	547.90							558.90
GPR	407.90							407.90
PRO/PRS	128.25	7.00						135.25
Federal	9.00	4.00						13.00
SEG	2.75							2.75
Legislature	829.97							829.97
Legislators - GPR	132.00							132.00
Assembly Staff - GPR	253.50							253.50
Senate Staff - GPR	194.50							194.50
Legislative Technology Services- GPR	21.00							21.00
Retirement Committee - GPR	3.00							3.00
Revisor of Statutes - GPR	11.00							11.00

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Legislative Reference Bureau - GPR	56.00							56.00
Legislative Audit Bureau								
GPR	67.00							67.00
PRS	21.80							21.80
Legislative Fiscal Bureau - GPR	35.00							35.00
Legislative Council - GPR	35.17							35.17
Lieutenant Governor's Office	7.75							7.75
GPR	7.75							7.75
Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board	2.00							2.00
SEG	2.00							2.00
Military Affairs	384.26							384.26
GPR	118.83							118.83
PRO/PRS	26.25							26.25
Federal	239.18							239.18
Natural Resources	2,908.82							2,908.57
GPR	520.28							520.28
PRO/PRS	250.64							250.64
Federal	451.55	0.75	-1.00					451.30
SEG	1,686.35							1,686.35
Personnel Commission	10.00							10.00
GPR	10.00							10.00
Public Defender	530.60							530.60
GPR	526.60							526.60
PRO/PRS	4.00							4.00

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Public Instruction	606.95							611.95
GPR	327.36							327.36
PRO/PRS	79.37	1.00						80.37
Federal	200.22	5.00	-1.00					204.22
Public Lands	9.00							10.00
PR	9.00	1.00						10.00
Public Service Commission	191.75							191.75
PRO/PRS	190.75							190.75
Federal	1.00							1.00
Regulation and Licensing	131.50							138.50
PRO	131.50	7.00						138.50
Revenue	1,297.70							1,297.70
GPR	907.75							907.75
PRO/PRS	254.45							254.45
Federal	0.00							0.00
SEG	135.50							135.50
Secretary of State	7.50							7.50
PRO	7.50							7.50
State Fair Park Board	47.70							47.70
PRO	47.70							47.70
State Treasurer	15.50							15.50
PRO/PRS	15.50							15.50

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Supreme Court	190.00							190.00
GPR	112.00							112.00
PRO/PRS	73.00							73.00
SEG	5.00							5.00
TEACH	6.00							6.00
GPR	6.00							6.00
Transportation	3,895.45							3,895.45
PRO/PRS	17.00							17.00
Federal	946.62							946.62
SEG	2,931.83							2,931.83
Tourism	62.25							62.25
GPR	58.25							58.25
PR	1.00							1.00
SEG	3.00							3.00
University of Wisconsin	27,812.10							27,842.04
GPR	18,259.75							18,259.75
PRO/PRS	5,874.01			3.85	-29.44			5,848.42
Federal	3,591.65			78.85	-23.32			3,647.18
SEG	86.69							86.69
U.W. Hospitals & Clinic Board	1,556.71							1,556.71
PR	1,556.71							1,556.71
Veterans Affairs	820.80							822.30
GPR	6.30							6.30
PRO/PRS	694.24							694.24
SEG	116.26							116.26
FED	4.00	1.50						5.50

REPORT ON POSITIONS AUTHORIZED - JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	Budgeted Positions for FY99*(7/1/98)	Approved Under s. 16.50 Adds	Approved Under s. 16.50 Deletes	UW Approved Adds	UW Approved Deletes	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Adds	JFC or Misc. Leg.* Deletes	Totals as of 9/30/98
Wisconsin Technical College System	81.30							82.30
GPR	38.65							38.65
PRO/PRS	13.00							13.00
Federal	29.65	1.00						30.65
Workforce Development	2,428.35							2,459.35
GPR	297.74					6.00		303.74
PRO/PRS	661.74	25.00						686.74
Federal	1,461.37							1,461.37
SEG	7.50							7.50
TOTALS	63,635.19	69.05	-7.00	82.70	-52.76	13.00	0.00	63,740.18
GPR	33,290.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.00	0.00	33,301.10
PRO/PRS	16,937.86	52.80	0.00	3.85	-29.44	0.00	0.00	16,965.07
Federal	8,058.90	16.25	-7.00	78.85	-23.32	0.00	0.00	8,123.68
SEG	5,348.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	5,350.33

REPORT ON SURPLUS POSITIONS AUTHORIZED
JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	C Unclassified Service Leaves	D, E Medical, Education or Personal Leaves	A, B, I, X Double-filled Positions	Reason for Double-fill
Administration				
GPR		+1.0		Medical Leave of Absence
PR		+2.0; - 1.0		Medical Leave of Absence
Corrections				
GPR			+151.0	Officer Pre-Service Program
District Attorneys				
GPR		+3.0; -1.0		Leave of Absence
Employe Trust Funds				
SEG		-1.0		
Employment Relations				
GPR		-1.0		
Health and Family Services				
GPR			+7.0; -104	96 of 104 split funded between GPR/FED
PR		-2.0	+2.0; -4.0	Medical Leave of Absence
FED			+3.0	
Insurance				
PR			+1.0	
Justice				
GPR		+1.0; -3.0		Leave of Absence
Natural Resources				
PR			-1.0	
Public Defender				
GPR		+.5		Leave of Absence
Public Service Commission				
PR		-1.0		
Transportation				
SEG			-9.0	

REPORT ON SURPLUS POSITIONS AUTHORIZED
JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1998

Agency	C Unclassified Service Leaves	D, E Medical, Education or Personal Leaves	A, B, I, X Double-filled Positions	Reason for Double-fill
Workforce Development				
GPR			-1.0	
PR	+3.0			Unclassifed Leave of Absence
FED		+2.0		Leave of Absence

Pool Code Types
A= Understudy, 3 months or longer.
B= Overlap replacement, less than 3 months for on-the-job training.
C= Leave of absence replacement. Temporary hire during permanent employe's authorized leave to unclassified service.
D= Leave-of-absence designation when permanent employe's authorized leave is less than 12 months.
E= Leave-of-absence replacement. Temporary hire during permanent employe's authorized leave which is expected to last more than 12 months.
I= Extended illness or worker's compensation (employe using accumulated sick leave or being paid through worker's compensation).
X= DOA approved hire in anticipation of attrition (high turnover positions).